DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 818 HE 031 672

AUTHOR	Gappa, Judith M.; MacDermid, Shelley M.
TITLE	Work, Family, and the Faculty Career. New Pathways: Faculty Career and Employment for the 21st Century Working Paper Series, Inquiry #8.
INSTITUTION	American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	38p.; For related documents, see HE 0031 666-678.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; phone: 202-293-6440, ext. 11; fax: 202-293-0073 ($8.50 members, $10 nonmembers; subscription to all 14 papers: $120 members, $140 nonmembers).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Careers; *College Faculty; Dual Career Family; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Recruitment; Faculty Workload; Family Life; *Family Work Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Environment; Job Satisfaction; Morale; Organizational Climate; Quality of Working Life; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

This paper, one in a series about the priorities of the professoriate, examines work-family issues as they affect faculty recruitment, retention, and productivity. Following a brief discussion of changing work-force demographics, the first part of the paper examines the structure of an academic career, focusing particularly on junior faculty and the tenure decision. The discussion covers workloads, the career path to tenure, and the effects of decentralization. The second section looks at various campus work-family initiatives, noting that "leadership" campuses tend to share certain family-friendly cultures at dual-career couples and at how a few medical schools have restructured their standard work and career arrangements. Section 3 looks beyond academe to see what can be learned from industry and other employers. It notes that development of work-family programs typically goes through several stages of evolution. It also finds that work-family programs are effective in addressing impediments to employee effectiveness. The final section suggests practical strategies for work-family programs, noting that such programs must be comprehensive and cover all career stages, that they require institutional support and leadership, that work must be redesigned so that faculty can integrate work-family responsibilities, and that they require fundamental changes in academic culture. (Contains 42 references.) (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 424 818

Work, Family, and the Faculty Career

By Judith M. Gappa
Vice President for Human Relations and
Professor of Educational Administration,
Purdue University

and

Shelley M. MacDermid
Associate Professor and Director,
Center for Families, Purdue University

INQUIRY #8

HE 031 622

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

FORUM ON Faculty Roles & Rewards

AAHE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

NEW PATHWAYS: FACULTY CAREERS AND EMPLOYMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

A PROJECT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

About the Authors

Judith M. Gappa is vice president for human relations and professor of educational administration at Purdue University. During 1980-1991, she was associate vice president for faculty affairs at San Francisco State University, where she was responsible for all personnel actions, affecting approximately 1,800 faculty. Previously, she held positions at Utah State University and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, in Boulder, CO. She has been a member of the faculty at San Francisco State University and Utah State University. Her most recent book, *The Invisible Faculty* (Jossey-Bass, 1993), coauthored with David Leslie, is about part-time and temporary faculty.

Shelley M. MacDermid is associate professor and director of the Center for Families at Purdue University and current president of the Indiana Council on Family Relations. She earned an M.B.A. and a Ph.D. in human development and family studies from the Pennsylvania State University. Her research focuses on links between work conditions and family life, with special attention to organizational size. Her articles have appeared in the *Journal of Adult Development, Family Relations,* and *Human Resource Management Review.* In 1994, the Groves Conference on Marriage and Family honored her with its Feldman Award for work in the field of sex roles pertaining to families.

About the New Pathways Working Paper Series

The Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards is a special program of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). It works with faculty leaders, senior academic administrators, trustees, legislators, and others interested in refocusing faculty priorities to address pressing institutional and societal needs.

To advance this agenda, AAHE initiated a project called "New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century." The New Pathways Working Paper Series addresses key issues related to changing faculty careers and employment arrangements; the series consists of 14 papers to be released during 1996-1997.

The American Association for Higher Education is a national, individual-membership organization that brings people together — across hierarchies, sectors, and disciplines — in the common cause of improving the quality of higher education.

Any opinions expressed in this Inquiry are those of its author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of AAHE's members, nor does publication necessarily imply their endorsement by the Association.

© 1997 American Association for Higher Education. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

Ordering Information

Additional copies of this Inquiry or the complete, fourteen-Inquiry Working Paper Series package (to be released over 1996-1997) can be purchased using the order form found on the last page of this paper, or by contacting:

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
202/293-6440 x11, fax 202/293-0073

Reprint Permission

AAHE's New Pathways project has as one of its missions to disseminate information and foster discussion. With that purpose in mind, AAHE grants to the purchaser of this Working Paper permission to photocopy and distribute it.

Design by Kerrie Kemperman

Foreword

In 1992, AAHE entered into the growing national debate about the priorities of the professoriate by establishing the Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards — a program that sponsors an annual national conference, issues publications, and serves as a general clearinghouse. Thus, when tenure surfaced in the spring of 1994 as a major issue of conversation and media attention, we became an interested party in the discussion.

On reflection, we decided that what was needed was not another familiar debate about the pros and cons of tenure but a new dialogue — a dialogue in which tenure was placed in a larger context of fresh thinking about two questions: What career paths make sense for the professoriate of the 21st century? What varieties of employment arrangements might most appropriately undergird these paths?

We also concluded that what might best help campuses work through these questions was not more philosophical argument but concrete options: practical ideas about new career paths and imaginative employment arrangements that campuses could try on for size.

AAHE's New Pathways project seeks to carry out that agenda. Project activities include (1) sponsoring forums to advance the dialogue; (2) serving as a general clearinghouse; and (3) initiating investigations into selected, particular issues.

Central direction for the project is provided by a three-person team: R. Eugene Rice, director of AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards; Richard Chait, professor of higher education, Harvard Graduate School of Education; and Judith Gappa, professor and vice president for human relations at Purdue University. Richard Chait's part of the project, which focuses on creative employment arrangements, is supported by a generous grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts.

The project team in turn benefits from the wise counsel of a four-person national advisory panel: Richard Lyman, president emeritus, Stanford University (chair); Andrew Hurwitz, attorney; Ejner Jensen, professor of English and special counsel to the president, University of Michigan; and Linda Wilson, president, Radcliffe College.

We wanted to make our own investigations quickly available in a form that was affordable, easily duplicated, and suggestive of what they really are: works in progress, intended to stimulate and enrich further discussion.

Russell Edgerton

President, American Association for Higher Education

March 1996

Work, Family, and the Faculty Career

by Judith M. Gappa and Shelley M. MacDermid

Recruiting and retaining the best faculty is fundamental to an institution's academic quality. Colleges and universities (along with industry and government) are realizing that an increasingly important factor in making a career attractive is the ability of employees to manage work and family responsibilities. At the same time, most colleges and universities are under pressures to keep costs down. Work-family initiatives, rather than constituting a drain on resources, can be cost-effective and have shown a good return on investment (Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996: 6).

The industrial-era employment model, based on a traditional view of the family, regards "family" and "work" as separate systems to be maintained by a gender-based division of labor. Despite its continuing influence with employers, the model is hardly relevant today as changes in employee demographics, lifestyles, and beliefs prompt changes in the structure of work and the assumptions that underlie employment policies and practices (Hughes and Galinsky 1994). Indeed, many employees are questioning these work assumptions, the design of jobs, required work times, criteria for work success, and career path profiles. For employers to insist on traditional employment patterns that assume an employee's primary commitment is to work puts them out of sync with this changed work force.

This paper considers work-family issues as they affect faculty recruitment, retention, and productivity. While colleges and universities traditionally have thought of themselves as educational institutions, they are also employers, often large employers, in their communities. As academic employees, faculty fall under their employer's work-family policies and programs. But, their assignments and careers are different from those of their coworkers in crucial ways. Thus, we look at faculty from a dual perspective: as employees with access to general institutional work-family policies and practices, and as professionals whose careers uniquely impact their work-family balance.

In Part 1 of this paper, we probe faculty work-family issues by looking at the structure of the academic career and what constitutes faculty work. Our emphasis is on junior faculty and the tenure decision, since that career period tends to be the most stressful and usually coincides with prime

childbearing and childrearing responsibilities. In the middle sections, we look at examples of good practices already in place in higher education (Part 2) and elsewhere (Part 3). And we conclude in Part 4 with a discussion of new ways of thinking about the academic career, the workplace, and the integrating of personal and academic lives.

But first, let's define terms. *Work-family policies and programs* are employment arrangements that affect or have the potential to affect family life. They may be government-initiated (e.g., the Family and Medical Leave Act), employer-initiated (e.g., flexible scheduling and compensation packages), or jointly initiated (e.g., flexible spending accounts)(MacDermid and Targ 1995: 146). We define *family* to include single- and dual-parent homes, cohabiting couples, people living alone, same-gender parents, "step" families, and intergenerational families. While this broad definition is more inclusive than many currently in use, it contains the affective and economic commitments to partners, children, or elders that are typically associated with families. During their careers, employees are likely to experience several of these diverse family structures.

Demographics and Caveats

Work-family issues of faculty cannot be considered in isolation from changing work force demographics and some general caveats about work-family policies. Let's look at some of them to set the stage for our discussion of the academic career.

Changing Demographics

Changing demographics have placed work-family issues among employees' top priorities:

- The number of women in the labor force has increased by 250 percent since 1960 to 46 percent of the total, and the proportion of married women employed or looking for work has doubled. Men's labor force participation rates are declining as women's continue to rise (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1995: Tables 633, 636, 637). By 2000, 61 percent of all American women will be employed, and most of these women will be mothers (Benedict and Taylor 1995: 2).
- Half of all working families (50 percent) have more than one earner (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1995: Table 678). Just one in five workers in the U.S. labor force (or 8.6 million families in 1993) now resides in a "traditional" family with one male earner. More than 10 million workers are single parents. More families are supported solely by women than by men.
- Many families no longer can afford to have an adult member at home full time. Family incomes

(adjusted for inflation) have risen over the past 25 years only for families with at least two earners (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1995: Table 738).

- More often than not, individuals will be part of more than one family configuration during their lives, due to marriage, divorce, death, and other occurrences (Benedict and Taylor 1995: 2).
- The population is aging. Due to advances in medicine and technology, the group over the age of 85 is the fastest-growing segment of the population. Some 25 to 30 percent of employees have elder care responsibilities, occupying them from 12 to 35 hours per week (Herndon 1995: 35).
- Nearly 9 out of 10 U.S. workers live in households with family members. About half of the members of the U.S. labor force have caregiving responsibility for children under 18, or for disabled or elderly adults (Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman 1993: 43).
- Two out of every five employees report problems in managing work and family life (Raabe 1997: 1).

Caveats

Work-family programs and policies affect all constituents on a campus. Employers should consider the needs of all employees in designing them for reasons of equity and to avoid fragmentation and confusion over what benefit or program applies to what class of employee. While some work-family practices may respond to particular aspects of academic careers, most will be more broadly applied.

While faculty often experience the tensions of multiple roles and competing interests, they still remain a relatively privileged group, both on and off campus. Consider this: Earners raise their income, on average, by about 30 percent for each graduate degree obtained. The average annual earnings of an assistant professor ($38,500 in 1993) were greater than the median income for all American families ($36,959). Among families in which a member has a doctorate, 64 percent are in the top 20 percent of American family incomes and 27 percent are in the top 5 percent (in excess of $113,182). In contrast, among families in which the head of the household has less than a ninth-grade education and families in which the head of the household has just a high school diploma, 75 percent and 43 percent, respectively, fall into the bottom 40 percent of the family income distribution, earning less than $30,000 per year (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1995). This bottom 40 percent of families includes many of the clerical and service workers on college campuses. Even if their employer offers benefits programs such as flexible spending accounts, optional insurance coverage, subsidized child care, or retirement

savings plans, such employees may not have the "extra" money necessary to take advantage of them.

Much discussion of work-family issues on college campuses centers on women. Because the probationary period for tenure typically converges on the period for bearing and rearing young children, and because women do most domestic work, they experience special pressures. Compared with all women, female faculty have traditionally been disproportionately childless. A study of one research university found that more than 44 percent of women assistant professors had no children, 30 percent reported they had decided never to have children, and 49 percent had postponed having children. Forty-three (43) percent of the women who participated in the study reported that the time children required presented a serious threat to their chances for tenure (Finkel and Olswang 1996: 129).

Framing work-family issues only around women is risky business, however. It is appropriate to acknowledge the unique challenges faced by women and to take them into account when designing work-family programs. But framing the programs as directed particularly toward women just perpetuates the view that family work is women's work, and makes it more difficult for men to participate fully in family life (Lambert 1993). Hughes and Galinsky (1988) found that employed fathers reported more stress than men who were not parents, and that the gender of the parent-worker was not a significant predictor of childrearing's interference with work (254).

The media often depict work-family programs as applying mainly to families with young children, when in fact families of all types face work-family challenges throughout life. For example, school-aged children too young to stay alone finish school by mid-afternoon and need adult supervision. The nation's elderly population and the need for elder care doubled between the 1980s and mid-1990s and are expected to double or triple again in the first quarter of the 21st century (Herndon 1995: 35).

Keeping the total work force in mind when examining work-family policies, practices, and programs is essential, since institutional policies and benefits normally extend beyond one category of employee. We will return to work-family policies for all employees, including faculty, later. We now turn our attention to faculty careers.

PART I

THE NATURE OF FACULTY WORK

Faculty work possesses unique attributes that make it distinct from other employment and that impact faculty members' ability to balance their personal and professional lives. The Higher Education Research Institute's 1995-96 national survey of college and university faculty probed sources of satisfaction and stress reported by 33,986 full-time faculty members in 384 colleges and universities (as reported in Magner 1996). The greatest level of satisfaction (86 percent) came from faculty autonomy and independence. By far the most common sources of stress reported were time pressures (86 percent), lack of a personal life (81 percent), and managing household responsibilities (69 percent). Women faculty showed higher stress levels than men, reporting 92 percent, 90 percent, and 76 percent, respectively.

What is it about faculty work that causes stress, and how might work-family initiatives assist faculty in achieving better balance between their careers and their families?

Workload

Contrary to popular belief, faculty members work long hours. A survey of professors at a large technical university found that the median workload is almost 60 hours per week, and more than 10 percent of faculty spend about 75 hours a week on professional work (Bailyn 1993: 51).

While faculty find their greatest satisfaction in their autonomy and independence, they also face multiple demands for their time and multiple expectations for accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. As a result, their work time is fragmented among diverse and conflicting priorities. Students have high expectations for faculty performance in the classroom, and faculty cannot easily find replacements when they are sick or have emergencies. As good academic citizens, faculty are expected to serve on committees and meet other departmental, campus, and professional service obligations. Simultaneously, they must produce research and scholarly work. Yet, the mental requirements for research (concentration, uninterrupted periods of time, meeting productivity schedules for grants or publications) conflict with the expectations faculty face for being available to students and performing various service functions. Bailyn (1993) comments:

The academic career therefore is paradoxical. Despite its advantages of independence

> and flexibility, it is psychologically difficult. The lack of ability to limit work, the tendency to compare oneself primarily to the exceptional giants in one's field, and the high incidence of overload make it particularly difficult for academics to find a satisfactory integration of work with private life.... It is the unbounded nature of the academic career that is the heart of the problem. Time is critical for professors, because there is not enough of it to do all the things their job requires: teaching, research, and institutional and professional service. It is therefore impossible for faculty to protect other aspects of their lives. (51f)

Faculty workloads are exacerbated when their spouses also are professionals, with the concomitant and compelling demands for commitment to a dual-career family.

The Career Path to Tenure

The AAUP's "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" established the guidelines under which most tenure systems operate today. The academic career typically begins with a probationary period of up to seven years of full-time service. During this period, faculty are evaluated periodically, with the tenure decision normally occurring in the sixth year (AAUP 1990: 4); thus, they have a fixed amount of time to prepare. Time pressures and conflicting priorities are greatest in these years before tenure, when junior faculty strive simultaneously to meet stated and unstated expectations of senior colleagues and to manage their personal lives.

While the institution develops and promulgates tenure policies and procedures, they are interpreted and acted on within each academic department where the senior faculty make tenure recommendations. This power of senior faculty forces junior faculty to align their personal and professional interests to the senior faculty's demands. In the best academic departments, senior faculty mentor junior faculty, expectations for tenure are clear, and junior faculty are protected from capricious requests for activities that will not count toward tenure. However, academe's decentralized nature, with its variation in departmental cultures and disciplinary criteria for tenure, can result in inconsistencies in how institutional policies and procedures for the award of tenure and promotion are carried out.

Junior faculty talked about the probationary period's effects as part of AAHE's "Heeding New Voices" project. [For more from these interviews conducted in 1995, watch for Working Paper #7.] They described time pressures in meeting the conflicting demands for research, teaching, and service, particularly when expectations for tenure changed or seemed unclear and senior faculty made simultaneous requests for a variety of activities. Most junior faculty interviewed felt they neither had adequate control over their time nor had achieved a satisfactory balance among competing activities. They described themselves as "in a juggling act" or "seriously sleep deprived."

Diversity

The experiences of women and minorities in faculty careers are qualitatively different from those of white men (Johnsrud and Des Jarlais 1994).

- Minorities constitute approximately 11% of faculty (NEA 1995: 3).
- 28% of women faculty, compared with 60% of men faculty, are tenured (NEA 1995: 4).
- Among new faculty, men (78%) are more likely to be married than women (62%), and women are more than twice as likely to be divorced (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster 1995: 8).
- 15% of senior faculty and 40% of assistant professors are women. A report on gender equity in the University of Wisconsin system showed that between 1981 and 1990, the system hired 1,281 and lost 955 women faculty (Finkel and Olswang 1996: 123).
- Women and minority faculty tend to be tenured and promoted more slowly. Johnsrud and Des Jarlais (1996) label the barriers they face as: *institutionally based or structural* (e.g., funding for research, computer access, graduate assistants); *professionally based* (e.g., departmental support, clear tenure criteria, adequate preparation and orientation); and *personally based* (e.g., physical health, time for personal life or parenting, emotional support). They found that all these categories of barriers played a role in the qualitative differences among women and minorities in their experiences as junior faculty.

As revealed in the interviews, concern about time management was exacerbated as junior faculty tried to balance career demands and the tenure rat race versus family time and personal time. This was true for single and married faculty, with or without children. All of them were making choices, and very few were satisfied with those choices. Some were setting limits on their academic involvement to have some time with their families:

> Today is my anniversary and I have two kids. I don't want to miss all of this. I force myself to drop things cold.

Other junior faculty acknowledged with regret that they were losing valuable time with spouses and children because of their commitment to their career:

> I have two kids, ages 9 and 11. I don't have time to even look at their homework. I'm up at 6 AM and gone, back at 11 PM. All I have time to do is sleep.

For dual-career faculty, finding time for their families actually can jeopardize their careers. George Baker, an associate professor of business at Harvard University, described the situation for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*:

> What this means is you are making compromises when not everyone is making them. You are in a horse race with others, and it is very, very costly to start making those compromises. (as quoted in Wilson 1995: A24)

Single faculty acknowledged they were devoting all their time and energy to their careers but realized what they were missing:

> I spend my life here. The graduate students see it and don't like it. I am not a good role model for them.

Most of the junior faculty felt that senior faculty who had not experienced the conflicting demands of a dual-career couple did not understand its stresses:

> How empathetic are senior faculty? They say, "For six years I didn't have a family life."
>
> Neither my chair nor my colleagues have any idea how much time it takes to raise kids.

One senior faculty member and department head commented:

> We all struggle with the balance between personal, family, friends, and work lives. Others are working 60-80 hours a week and doing a great job. People who make the extended commitment get the rewards.

All these factors can produce enormous stress for junior faculty dependent on the positive impressions of senior faculty when tenure decisions are made:

> I have found that too much socializing with one's department members is threatening. Social bonds are used in this department to build voting coalitions. The problem is, if I withdraw, I risk negative effects. I have no idea how to solve this problem.

So, while faculty cite independence and autonomy as major attractions of the academic career, many junior faculty feel largely cut off from their colleagues by the competition for advancement, and are reluctant to discuss their difficulties for fear of exposing weaknesses. In the "Heeding New Voices" study, junior faculty talked about not being part of the "community of scholars" they thought they were joining. They reported alienation from their senior colleagues, a lack of mentoring, and a "sink or swim" mentality. Rice (1996) attributes this disconnection from colleagues and stress in their personal lives to the priority faculty place on autonomy:

> Of special concern across the interviews was the fear of "having to forego a personal life....." Today, faculty get trapped by the contradiction built into the academic career. They are drawn by the autonomy and flexibility they assume the career affords, but find that in the early years ... the time required to maintain a balanced life is not available. (24)

The Effects of Decentralization

Within academe's relatively decentralized structure, resources, policies, and procedures are disseminated from the central administration to schools and then to academic departments. Department heads and senior faculty often interpret and apply centrally promulgated policies and resources idiosyncratically, based on department cultures, missions, and circumstances. Thus, decentralization can lead to inconsistency and inequity. Further, decentralized funding and varying ability among disciplines to attract external funds affect what resources are available to academic departments — resources which could be used to replace faculty on leave for childbearing, parenting, or elder care. Departments with the most faculty requesting time off for family care reasons may have the least budgetary flexibility to support the leave requests with replacement faculty.

Decentralization can also hamper the creation of an environment sensitive to work-family conflicts because it makes communicating and cooperating across structures difficult. Campuses typically initiate and run work-family programs within Human Resources offices; faculty employment is governed by policies and criteria developed by faculty and overseen by Academic Affairs. That work-family programs exist does not necessarily mean they are integrated throughout the institution or accepted by all faculty in all departments. Even ensuring that faculty know such programs exist can be difficult. For faculty to feel comfortable in using them requires a family-friendly departmental culture. Thus, a faculty member's hesitancy to request a leave, for example, may be less a budget issue and more

a cultural one, in that his or her colleagues might view such a leave as disturbing the department's curriculum or hampering its effectiveness.

PART 2

Work-Family Initiatives on Campuses

We now turn to the status of existing work-family initiatives on campuses. These initiatives include general employee policies and programs, and programs directed specifically at faculty.

In the fall of 1995, a comprehensive survey modeled after surveys of large corporations and state agencies was sent to 3,343 colleges and universities. It sought to gather information in four areas:

- Basic demographics.
- Campus environment.
- Existing work-family programs and their availability to faculty, other employees, and students.
- Obstacles campuses were encountering in creating a family-friendly environment.

Results of the survey, conducted by the College and University Personnel Association Foundation and the Families & Work Institute, were published as the *College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs* (Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996). The *Guide* is the definitive resource for campus administrators, faculty, and staff seeking information about family-friendly policies and practices in use on campus today.

Leadership Campuses

In analyzing the survey responses, the researchers assigned points for each work-family program offered and for a range of indicators that suggest a family-friendly culture. The programs included information and counseling, flexible scheduling, time and leave policies, dependent care, communications, and community relationships to support working families. The indicators included attitudes about the culture, organizational knowledge about work-family needs, and efforts to implement strategic links to other human resource concerns such as recruitment, retention, and diversity.

From these point scores, the researchers developed an "Index of Campus Work-Family Initiatives," with a Global Index Score; and they labeled institutions that scored in the top 25 percent "leadership campuses." These leadership campuses administer about 30 programs or policies (versus

an overall average of 18) designed to help employees balance their work responsibilities and their personal and family lives. The *Reference Guide* profiles the policies and practices of these 94 leadership campuses as benchmarks for other colleges and universities. Leadership campuses tend to share certain characteristics:

- Larger operating budgets, student enrollments, and numbers of employees.
- Doctoral programs.
- Human resource managers familiar with the family demographics of employees and focused on strategic planning and change management.
- Targeted diversity efforts.
- Connections between work-family efforts and strategic issues of morale, recruitment, and retention.
- Commitment of top administrators and faculty to work-family initiatives, with department chairs seen as critical to success of work-family efforts.
- Completed needs assessments.
- Campuswide task forces.

While larger campuses with greater resources would seem to have the edge, smaller and less-affluent institutions can overcome resource limitations with human resource managers who possess a broad, strategic view and are knowledgeable about the family demographics of their employees. The association of doctoral programs with family friendliness may arise from heightened competition to attract and keep top faculty at research universities.

Many of the specific programs and policies offered by leadership campuses can be replicated at other institutions. However, making them available does not ensure they will actually be used. Leadership campuses reported that employees use flextime and leave for dependent care moderately; they rarely use job sharing, telecommuting, "stop-the-tenure-clock" policies, emergency child care, or elder care referral services.

Level of use of work-family programs appears to be dependent in part on their potential career penalties. That is, when faculty perceive a program to have no negative career impact, it is likely to be more widely used. Thus, the key to effective programs lies in monitoring their use. However, only 18 percent of the campuses surveyed reported keeping data on program users, and only 8 percent had evaluated any particular program or policy (Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996: 64).

Campuses must ensure that faculty members who use work-family policies and programs are

Prevalence of Selected Programs and Policies at "Leadership Campuses"

- Part-time work schedules (99%).
- Flextime (more frequently offered informally) (97%).
- Phased return from family leave (95%).
- Employee assistance programs (90%).
- Wellness programs (88%).
- Compressed work weeks (82%).
- "Stop-the-tenure-clock" policies (80%).
- Handbook on work-family policies (78%).
- Child care centers (72%), of which 92% are located on site; 91% are open year-round; and all serve infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and school-age children after school.
- Regularly scheduled work-at-home and telecommuting (68%).
- Reduction of faculty workload for dependent care (68%).
- Training/guidance to supervisors on work-family issues (65%).
- Phased retirement (59%).
- Relocation services (52%).
- Elder care referral counseling (48%).
- Designated work-family staff (45%).
- Time off with pay to care for domestic partner (40%).

(Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996: 39-41)

not subsequently penalized. For example, the availability of "stop-the-tenure-clock" policies would seem critical for tenure-track faculty (primarily women, but increasingly men too) who are contemplating having children or are already caring for them. Yet, 33 percent of the leadership campuses offering such policies do so only informally. When employers are unwilling to take an official position, does the opportunity to use the policy really exist? In such an ambiguous environment, faculty fear career penalties if they "stop the tenure clock" (120). They should not fear they will be held to a different or higher standard of productivity just because they spent more total time in the probationary period caring for children and using an official college or university policy, for example. Faculty and administrators who review tenure cases need to fully understand "stop-the-tenure-clock" policies and how to evaluate these cases appropriately.

Dual-Career Couples

Faculty candidates compete for positions in a national market. When they are members of dual-career couples, they seek relocation assistance and job opportunities for their spouse or partner either at the campus or nearby. Some faculty turn down positions at distant campuses in order to stay with their families (Wilson 1996). Institutions that have the best relocation-assistance and family programs will be the most successful in recruiting and retaining faculty.

Purdue University, for example, provides relocation assistance for both academic and nonacademic spouses. A relocation specialist works with the department head and search committee to provide prospective hires with information for their nonacademic spouse about the University and the surrounding area. Once hired, new faculty can have a relocation specialist work with their spouse on all aspects of the spouse's job search for up to a year (Brewer 1996).

Redesigning Work: The Medical Schools

Responding to employees' commitments to work and family involves restructuring work and careers. Raabe (1996) advocates shifting away from institutionalization of standard work and career arrangements and toward a pluralism of work options and career paths that are "equivalent" (3).

Medical schools have gone the furthest in putting Raabe's recommendations into practice. They are changing their employment structures so that their faculty can pursue academic careers without making either-or choices between family and career success. In this, they are the pacesetters in modifying traditional tenure systems. A survey by Jones and Sanderson (1994) found the following:

- Twenty (20) percent of medical schools have a fixed probationary period longer than seven years for clinical faculty, and another 11 percent reported having no fixed probationary period.
- Seventy-five (75) percent allow faculty to "stop the tenure clock," for a variety of reasons.
- Eighty-six (86) percent of medical schools with a fixed maximum probationary period allow extended pretenure-track employment for portfolio building, with later transfer to tenure-track status.

Froom and Bickel (1996) found in their survey that 33 percent of medical schools have provisions for part-time faculty who are committed to full professional effort. Medical faculty who choose to work less than full time, but whose entire professional effort is directed toward the academic medical center and who are likely (or eligible) to assume or return to full-time status at some point, may remain on the tenure track. Most of these schools lengthen the probationary period on a prorated basis for such faculty. They retain the perquisites of their full-time colleagues; they serve on institutional committees, have faculty voting privileges, and receive benefits if they work 50 percent of full time.

Medical schools are also developing multiple career tracks (some tenurable and some not) with equivalent salaries, benefits, and perquisites regardless of tenure status. The faculty member and the medical school decide on the appropriate track at the time of hire based on the faculty member's skills and experience in view of the functions to be performed. The University of Virginia Medical School, for example, has six tracks — three tenurable and three nontenurable. Faculty in all six tracks are appointed, evaluated, and promoted according to clearly defined criteria and using the same procedures; and all faculty have access to comprehensive orientation and mentoring programs (Gappa 1996: 21f). Faculty in nontenurable tracks like their greater flexibility to meet lifestyle responsibilities.

The University of Nebraska Medical Center has gone one step further and adopted a new single-track system for all academic appointments. The system retains tenure but removes time requirements and "up-or-out" provisions. Appointments are for a specified period, and there is no limit to the number of times they can be renewed. Faculty members may apply for tenure at any time, but they are not required to apply. Those who do go through the regular tenure review process. Faculty are not penalized if their application for tenure fails — instead, the faculty member reverts back to his or her existing contract, and may reapply at a later date (Wigton and Waldman 1993: 190).

PART 3
BEYOND ACADEME

What can we learn from industry and other employers that might apply to faculty employment?

Family-responsive programs and policies have a long history in the business world. As early as the Civil War, employers provided child care for working mothers (Friedman and Galinsky 1992). Work-family policies became more and less popular throughout the 20th century as the need for women in the labor force rose (e.g., during World War II) and fell (e.g., following the war)(MacDermid and Targ 1995). The steep rise during the past three decades in work force participation by mothers of young children has substantially increased the visibility and popularity of family-responsive policies, particularly in industries that require highly skilled labor (pharmaceuticals, engineering), have high percentages of women employees (financial services), or tend to grow rapidly (computer hardware and software). As global competition intensifies, more companies are looking to family responsiveness for strategic competitive advantage (Hammonds 1996).

For more than a decade, *Working Mother* magazine has published its list of the best employers for working mothers in the United States. Universities are relative newcomers to the list. No university made the *Working Mother* top 100 until Stanford in 1996, the 11th year of the rankings (Moskowitz 1996). Although many colleges and universities have long had on-site child care and relatively generous leave policies, such practices have usually been isolated examples and were not designed with comprehensive recognition of family needs in mind. Interest in work-family initiatives is recent among higher education institutions.

By understanding the evolution of family responsiveness in business, and by being aware of the wide range of innovative policies and programs developed by businesses, colleges and universities may more quickly reap the benefits of such programs while avoiding costly missteps.

Stages of Development of Work-Family Programs

One lesson colleges and universities can learn from business is that work-family programs typically follow a pattern in their evolution. A study by the Families & Work Institute identified three distinct stages of development in 188 of the largest companies in 30 industry groups selected from the Fortune 1000 (Galinsky, Friedman, and Hernandez 1991). Understanding these stages may facilitate smooth

construction and adoption of comprehensive work-family programs.

During stage one, "Developing a Programmatic Response," a small number of individuals begin to advocate that the company address employees' needs, typically for child care, in order to increase productivity. Corporate reluctance at this stage usually stems from concerns about overstepping boundaries between work and family, treating employees differently from one another, and awareness of only a narrow range of prohibitively expensive solutions. According to the study, effective champions argue for redefining equity as "fairly serving employees in different ways" (3), and make a business case for new family-friendly policies. As a result, one or two programs are implemented. It usually becomes evident fairly quickly, however, that stage-one solutions address the needs of only a small proportion of employees.

During stage two, "Developing an Integrated Approach," programs and policies broaden beyond child care. Employers begin to see work-family programs as ongoing, dynamic recruitment and retention tools rather than simply responses to a productivity problem. The focus may grow to include all personnel policies, time and leave policies, and other benefits. The employer may develop a coordinated package of programs, and appoint a work-family coordinator. Corporate commitment expands beyond the few champions to a larger portion of top-level management, who still are motivated mainly by the "bottom line." The employer may begin to interact with its surrounding community around work-family issues. A common problem at this stage is employees underuse the programs, even when they clearly qualify for and need them (e.g., men may not use parental leave). Typically, attention then turns to cultural messages or practices within the organization that are interfering with effective coordination of work and family demands. Front-line supervisors are recognized as key to making family-responsive policies fully available to all employees.

During stage three, "Changing the Culture," work-family programs are institutionalized and integrated with initiatives of diversity and gender equity. Attention turns to cultural messages about work and family communicated throughout the organization. The focus broadens again, to a life-cycle or "work-life" approach. The employer may make work-family content a regular feature of all employee training, and may consider work redesign around family issues. Work-life policies are recognized as central and strategic.

At the time of Galinsky, Friedman, and Hernandez's study, a third of those Fortune 1000 leaders had not yet reached even stage one. Forty-six (46) percent were at stage one; 19 percent were at stage two; and only 2 percent of the companies studied were at stage three. Considerable progress has occurred in the intervening time. In 1991, *Working Mother* could not name 100 companies worthy

of its "best workplaces" label. Now companies vie for consideration. Still, the *Working Mother* 100 represent just a small minority of U.S. employers.

As competition for employees (faculty) increases and as talented candidates seek family-friendly environments, higher education institutions, like corporations, will move to incorporate family-friendly policies and programs more quickly.

Effectiveness

A second lesson that colleges and universities can learn from industry is that work-family programs *can* effectively address serious impediments to employee effectiveness.

Tension between their work and family roles is among the most common, most evident, and most powerful influences on employee performance at home and at work:

- Such tension can impair an employee's physical and mental health and his or her work performance (Ironson 1992).
- Linked empirically to work-family tension are absenteeism, high turnover, tardiness, lack of concentration, and accidents (Ironson 1992).
- Affected by such tension are children's reading and math performance, safety, cleanliness, a stimulating home environment for children, and marital quality and stability (Parcel and Menaghan 1994; Voydanoff 1987).
- Excessive time at work and lack of control over work demands can interfere with performance at work and at home (Duxbury, Higgins, and Lee 1994; Lambert 1993).
- Healthy and productive employees need job requirements adapted to fit their individual needs and options to satisfy nonwork responsibilities (Lambert 1993).
- Of 8,000 employees surveyed for the September 16, 1996, cover story in *BusinessWeek*, 40 percent said that work has a negative impact on their home lives (Hammonds 1996).
- At IBM, dissatisfaction with work-family balance is as important as dissatisfaction with salary as a reason for leaving the company (Childs 1996).

Outcome studies suggest that the effects of family-responsive programs and policies are seen mostly in reduced absenteeism and tardiness, increased retention, and improved morale. Some evidence also exists of increased amounts and improved quality of output:

- Family-assistance programs at Corning (including job sharing and part-time work) reduced

turnover by one-half and costs by $2 million per year (Swiss and Walker 1993).

- At First Tennessee National Bank, supportive supervisors retained staff at twice the average rate and also retained customers longer (Hammonds 1996).
- Aetna saved $1 million in hiring and training costs by doubling its retention of new mothers (Hammonds 1996).
- For some companies, the costs of not offering leaves are greater than the costs of offering them. The Families & Work Institute reports the costs of the average parental leave of four months to be 32 percent of annual salary, while replacement costs are 75-150 percent of salary (Shellenbarger 1996).

Recent emphases on "total quality management" and "reengineering" have led some employers to redesign jobs and to include employees as experts in the process. One recent initiative focused explicitly on redesigning work to help employees to function more effectively at home and at work. When managers and researchers at Xerox altered work arrangements to remove factors employees had identified as "ways work gets done around here that make it difficult for you to integrate your work and personal life," absenteeism dropped 30 percent, customer response times shortened, and a new product line was completed on schedule for the first time (Hammonds 1996).

In that September 1996 issue, *BusinessWeek* concluded that giving workers more control over their work conditions can ease tension between work and family roles, increase productivity, and provide a competitive advantage. James Rogers, CEO of Cinergy, summarized the competitive advantage perspective when he asserted:

> If people can find a job maximizing their capabilities, they will create great value for stakeholders. Happy employees create happy customers. We want to be the employer of choice. We want to create a nurturing environment where employees can do their best — displaying greater commitment and motivation, and producing better-quality work with less stress and turnover. Our programs are not just to be nice — they allow us to demand excellent performance. We are not paternalistic, and our employees are not entitled — this is a partnership, not a family. (Rogers 1996)

What should colleges and universities learn from findings about family responsiveness that have emerged from business experience?

First, programs or policies that severely constrain control, choice, or flexibility are unlikely to be successful. In a large, well-controlled comparison of flexible schedule options, for example, Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981) found that the amount of flexibility permitted (i.e., two hours at the beginning or end of the day) was too limited to help parents. Similarly, child care assistance tied to

only one specific child care program (e.g., on or near site) actually *reduced* the choice and flexibility available to employees and *exacerbated* the challenges of coordinating work and family demands.

Second, media reports describe tensions among employees created by family-responsive policies; for example, unmarried or childless employees who feel burdened by having to take on the work of employees with children who leave early. But such problems often are the result of unnecessarily restrictive rules for access to family-responsive policies or definitions of "family." To the extent that employers unnecessarily limit what qualifies as an acceptable reason for requesting leave or who qualifies as a "caregiver," family-responsive policies will be inequitably accessible.

Finally, even among companies deeply committed to family responsiveness, work-family managers may find their programs vulnerable during financial retrenchments. To ensure that the programs' connections to strategic business goals are clear and well understood requires unrelenting attention.

Looking Ahead

Corporate interest in work-family issues will continue to rise for several reasons. Growth in the labor force has now leveled off and the participation rates of men and women will soon converge as the influx of women, which has been the major source of growth for most of this century, is completed. Both women and men are becoming more discerning about evaluating employers in terms of work and family issues. And "Generation X" workers seem less accepting of the employment bargains their parents made — their commitment to work is not unlimited. To attract and retain workers, work-family programs and redesign of work will remain high priorities. The effectiveness of family-responsive programs has been demonstrated, as have the negative effects of failing to accommodate work-family needs. Both will receive greater attention as employers increasingly rely on higher productivity from smaller numbers of employees. Supportive companies attract new employees more easily, retain them more readily, and benefit generally from their higher morale.

The box on the next pages highlights the wide variety of family-responsive programs currently in place in industry and academe. We compiled this list to alert colleges and universities to all the work-family activities being tried elsewhere; to help them realize how many family-friendly policies they may already have in place; and to stimulate their thinking about new work-family policies and programs they may want to add.

Established Work-Family Programs

Traditional Benefits

Flexible insurance and benefits options
Health/dental insurance for self, spouse or domestic partner, children or stepchildren
Family and Medical Leave Act leaves
Paid vacation
Pension plan and/or 401
Insurance: long-term disability, Social Security participation, workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, short-term disability, accident

Dependent Care Assistance

Flexible spending accounts for dependent care
Financial assistance for adoption expenses
Dependent care discounts or subsidies; Vouchers to purchase child care
Reimbursement for dependent care expenses for business travel
Fee scales based on income
Elder care resource and referral
Adult day care; In-home or backup elder care
Child care resources, referral, or counseling
Employer-sponsored child care: on- or near-site, backup, snow day, before/after school, almost-well or evening (in home or center), holiday/vacation, infant
Summer camp for school-aged children
Support for bringing children on business travel

Flexible Time, Leave, and Workload Policies

Flextime: set own start and end times, work fewer hours one day and make up later, compressed work weeks, staggered schedules (4 days one week, 6 days the next)
Prorated or full benefits for part-time employees
Work at home; Telecommuting; Job sharing
Paid/unpaid time off for mothers/fathers for childbirth, parenting, adoption, foster care
Unpaid personal leaves of up to 3 years for dependent care
Paid/unpaid time off to care for sick children, elders, siblings, domestic partners
Banking of unused leave
Flexible vacation options (e.g., buying extra vacation days)
Personal leaves for a variety of reasons; Leave for volunteer work (e.g., in the schools)
Gradual phase-back from leave
Paid leave days for family emergencies, school meetings, doctors appointments, etc.
For faculty only: reduced workload, "stop the tenure clock," tenure for part-time faculty

Wellness

Fitness center, walking club
Health and wellness seminars, fairs, risk appraisals
Sports physicals for kids

Wellness services (mammography, colonoscopy, lab tests, flu vaccines)
Health care flexible spending accounts
Hotlines for medical assessment, referral
Employee Assistance Program
Nursing mother stations, breast pumps for rent
Long-term care insurance; Long-term care
Respite care, vision care, well-baby care
On-site health or dental care center
Coverage of alternative medical treatment
Reimbursement for expenses of extended family (e.g., parents, siblings)
Grief counseling

Retirement

Preretirement counseling
Phased retirement; Part-time employment for retirees
Retiree health or dental care; Life insurance
Benefits for beneficiaries (insurance, health care)

Education

Tool kits for supervisors, newsletters
Work/life information centers, resource libraries
Classes on parenting, prenatal care, healthy baby care, fathering
Support groups for single parents, elder care; Employee-run sessions on family topics
Stress-reduction workshops

Relocation

Relocation assistance for spouse
Moving expenses; Housing assistance; Reduced mortgage rates

Other

Convenience store
Concierge service: auto repair, theater tickets, travel reservations, home repairs
On-site shoe repair, dry cleaning, film processing; Take-home cafeteria store
Discounted bus service; Near-site housing
College savings plans; tuition discounts; tuition assistance for children/spouses; tuition assistance reimbursement
Assistance with legal fees for divorce, child custody, adoption, wills
Adoption assistance
Generous severance with advance notice

(Sources: Eli Lilly and Company 1996; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991; Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996; Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman 1993; Moskowitz 1996; Rogers 1996; Wilson 1995, Raabe 1997)

PART 4

New Ways of Thinking

Faculty have a dual identity: as employees of colleges and universities governed by the same policies and programs as other employees, and as academics with careers distinctly different from those of other employees. This duality guides the conclusions and recommendations that follow. We propose some new ways of thinking about work and family that apply to colleges and universities as employers, and some that apply directly to faculty. In both, faculty are the beneficiaries. Our objective remains to open up current thinking about how to enhance the faculty career by making it possible for men and women faculty to succeed in both their professional and family lives.

In the following pages, we build on, but do not duplicate, the practical strategies and ideas of Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson's *College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs* (1996). Their guide contains a wealth of information about work-family initiatives on campuses, including:

- The characteristics, policies, and programs of what they call "leadership campuses."
- Model initiatives of work-family programs covering dependent care, dual careers, "stopping the tenure clock," management training and education, and much more.
- Case studies of four universities.

We strongly recommend that readers seeking further information about specific strategies, types, and characteristics of work-family programs use this valuable and definitive resource, plus others listed in the References.

Comprehensiveness

Work-family concerns occur throughout a career. Employees who are parents faced with child care responsibilities become children who are concerned about elder care for their parents.

For work-family programs to be *substantively* comprehensive, they must cover all career stages. To be *structurally* comprehensive, they must be integrated within the environment of the college or university. Substantive and structural comprehensiveness are illustrated in the "Principles of Excellence in Work and Family" developed by Boston University's Work & Family Roundtable (see box). Substantively comprehensive work-family programs include information and support services,

Principles of Excellence in Work and Family

These "Principles" developed by the Boston University Work & Family Roundtable can guide organizations through a self-assessment process:

1. The employer recognizes the strategic value of addressing work and personal life issues.
   - Business is practiced with sensitivity to the employee's personal life needs.
   - Work/personal life solutions are aligned with business goals.
   - The employer's commitment to addressing work/personal life issues is viewed as a long-term investment.
   - Work/personal life strategies are flexible to meet changing organizational and employee needs.

2. The work environment supports individual work and personal life effectiveness.
   - The employer's informal culture supports a healthy work/personal life balance.
   - The employer provides meaningful work/personal life programs and policies.
   - The employer is committed to ongoing education of key stakeholders — employees, management, and the community.
   - The employer strives for continuous improvement through ongoing evaluation and assessment.

3. The management of work and personal life effectiveness is a shared responsibility between employer *and* employee.
   - Managers and employees are empowered to develop solutions that address both business and personal objectives.
   - Managers and employees are held accountable for their behavior in support of these objectives.

4. The employer develops relationships to enhance external work and personal life resources.
   - Partnerships are formed to maximize value of employer and community resources available to employees and community members.
   - The employer serves as an active role model.
   - The employer is open to working with the public sector to strengthen policy that benefits both employers and individuals.

Reprinted with permission from"Principles of Excellence in Work & Family," Center on Work & Family, Boston University, Boston, 1996.

dependent care assistance, flextime, leave and workload policies, wellness programs, and education about work-family issues for the campus community. Structurally comprehensive work-family programs include self-assessment of existing programs and activities; assessments of employees' needs for support; coordination, oversight, and evaluation of programs and activities; and sensitization and accountability of department heads, managers, and supervisors.

> Ultimately, it is not the number of policies or the originality of programs that determines whether an institution addresses work-family concerns effectively. Rather it is the comprehensiveness of the approach and the integration of work-life issues within the environment that distinguish exemplary efforts. (Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996: 135).

Leadership

Successful work-family programs have the support of the president, academic and administrative leaders, and faculty and are seen as contributing directly to the mission of the college or university. Policy statements, such as this one from Cornell University, demonstrate a university's or college's commitment to work-family programs:

> Cornell University is committed to policies, practices, and programs supportive of the members of its diverse community as they traverse the interlocking worlds of work and family. The University encourages, at all levels, an environment which is supportive of and sensitive to the needs and mutual dependence of the workplace and working families. (as quoted in Friedman, Rimsky, and Johnson 1996: 137)

Leaders ensure that appropriate actions are taken to make policy statements a reality for employees by

- Defining responsibility for work-family initiatives; educating department heads, managers, and supervisors; and holding them accountable for their actions in support of the institution's work-family policies and programs.
- Setting positive examples by treating their immediate staffs in ways that recognize both work and family responsibilities.
- Celebrating work-family successes, and publicly recognizing the individuals who are contributing to work-family initiatives or managing their own staffs in family-friendly ways.
- Monitoring and evaluating work-family programs. The key to developing effective programs lies in gathering information and using it to make changes where necessary.
- Ensuring faculty access to work-family policies and programs. Standardized guidelines or procedures (similar to AA/EEO requirements for national faculty searches) may be necessary

to ensure faculty in all academic departments have access to such programs without fear of penalties for using them.

- Identifying and eliminating policies or practices that restrict employee flexibility in favor of flexible ones — for example, giving employees a pool of leave days to be used flexibly, rather than requiring them to use leave according to overly restrictive categories.
- Training leaders at all levels. Department heads, managers, and supervisors need training to help them recognize work-family issues and to use appropriate policies or programs. Training can validate family issues as a management and supervisory concern, assist leaders in identifying attitudes that prevent them from recognizing and resolving work and family conflicts, and provide information about what programs are available to employees. (University Task Force on Dependent Care 1991: 47)

Without standardized implementation guidelines and training for leaders at all levels, the actual use of available options by employees throughout the institution may be inconsistent and dependent on the attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge of individual department heads and supervisors. Failure by department heads and senior faculty to recognize the existence of work-family problems and to help solve them can create considerable stress for faculty and inequities among different departments. Monitoring both individual faculty career progression (from time-of-hire through promotion to professor) and departmental use of work-family policies and programs will help pinpoint which departmental cultures are work-family friendly and which are not. Coordinated focus groups can also be excellent sources of information about how well policies and programs are known, accepted, and used at different levels within an institution.

Strategic Initiatives

Campuses that view work-family issues as an opportunity for strategic initiatives rather than as an added cost will be the most successful. Campuses can —

- Experiment with innovative ideas that cost little, and then evaluate the results.
- Benefit from the experience of other campuses and employers by contacting them directly or relying on national organizations and resources, such as the College and University Work-Family Association, the *College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs*, or Work

& Family Connection, Inc. [1]

- Conduct employee needs assessments, and charge task forces with developing recommendations.
- Perform cost-benefit analyses of work-family programs.

Work-family programs are often viewed as added costs that must somehow be absorbed into already tight budgets. But work-family initiatives are not necessarily expensive. Instead, they can involve new perspectives on what constitutes work and supervision, more flexibility, referrals to existing community resources, and a willingness to experiment with new ideas.

The costs of work-family initiatives must be compared with the costs of doing nothing. In a competitive environment, employers who fail to articulate and implement effective work-family programs may lose valuable employees and, over the longer term, see costs increase due to employee stress and low productivity. Rather than increasing costs, work-family programs can result in significant savings to institutions.

Redesign of Work

Most jobs have not been designed to acknowledge employees' nonwork responsibilities. Traditional work-family programs and policies actually encourage employees to work more, rather than supporting their involvement in family life (Lambert 1993). To redesign work so employees at all stages of their careers can integrate rather than segregate work-family responsibilities requires changing widely held beliefs and assumptions about work and productivity — e.g., replacing "face time" with telecommuting or flextime.

Challenging old assumptions and cultural beliefs frees employers and employees to think more creatively about work design and how to achieve a more equitable, productive, and innovative workplace. Bailyn (1993) concludes:

> We have seen that operational autonomy — discretion over the conditions of work — is critical to satisfactory and productive work as well as to the ability of employees to satisfy both work requirements and private demands. The most important aspect of this autonomy is the control over time. But if temporal autonomy is combined with demands for constant availability and a primary commitment to occupational work, its

[1] Work & Family Connection, Inc. (5197 Beachside Drive, Minnetonka, MN 55343) is a national clearinghouse of information about work-family and work-life issues. It has two monthly publications, a resource hotline, and other services for subscribers.

> potential advantage is nullified. True flexibility of time flows from a basic belief in the legitimacy of a balance of commitments between the private and public spheres. (95f.)

Embracing work redesign enables employers and employees to work together to provide flexibility and options under which employees assume control of their time, while employers define goals and output and assess results.

Faculty work, with its emphasis on independence and autonomy, appears to have achieved the goals of work redesign. But traditional tenure systems do not meet the needs of many faculty, especially junior faculty, to balance their work and professional lives. Work redesign of faculty careers must consider modifying the current tenure system. Modifications already in practice are "stop-the-tenure-clock" policies, extensions of probationary periods, and tenure for less-than-full-time effort. Making expectations for tenure clear and giving faculty flexibility in how to achieve those expectations would help. Junior faculty also need freedom from extraneous and unanticipated requirements for their time. Work redesign may involve collective decision making about scheduling departmental and committee meetings or changing workloads and responsibilities as family situations or career goals change.

Cultural Change

Redesign of work, especially faculty work, requires fundamental changes in academic culture. Family-responsive programs and policies will fail unless the campus culture supports them.

During stage three in the Galinsky, Friedman, and Hernandez typology, organizations often find their cultures constrain the effectiveness of family-responsive policies. Traditional messages are now being questioned: "Personal problems should be kept at home" ... "Presence equals performance" ... "Hours equal output" ... "Give them an inch and they'll take a mile" ... "Equitable means identical" ... "Benefit programs are provided for long-term income security and protection" (Galinsky, Friedman, and Hernandez 1991; Raabe 1996).

For faculty, cultural change is largely a departmental phenomenon. Academic departments have distinct cultures based on the discipline, traditions, and beliefs held by senior faculty (Kuh and Whitt 1988). The attitudes and behaviors of department chairs and senior faculty make an enormous difference to junior faculty. The willingness of departments to change their cultures with regard to work-family issues is crucial. Colleges and universities need to train and encourage department chairs to be adaptable and responsible, give them the resources and programs to work with, and then hold them accountable.

Attitudes and beliefs about equity are part of changing campus cultures. Traditionally, employers have defined "equity" as treating all employees in a given position the same. But equity is not the same as uniformity. In our diverse society, equal treatment may have very unequal consequences (Bailyn 1993: 113). Inequity is particularly likely when employers fail to respond to differences in the external constraints their employees face. For example, faculty who choose part-time employment to accommodate their family responsibilities often suffer career penalties such as disproportionately lower salaries and curtailed career opportunities in nontenurable appointments.

Equity means having the opportunity to be effective, to accomplish equally appropriate results in different ways. This requires each employee to be treated as an individual, and different strategies to accomplish the same result. In this concept of equity, career development is individualized, but standards and criteria do not change. The performance goal remains the same; how to achieve it varies among employees, who participate in making these decisions. Flexibility and options within the academic career (particularly during the pretenure probationary period) would go a long way toward solving work-family conflicts.

Beliefs about gender roles also must change. Formal policies and informal practices still reinforce gender-based expectations and make it difficult for women and men to work as faculty while managing dependent care responsibilities. Men generally hold the leadership positions — in colleges and universities as in industry. Most have benefited from a different life history — supported in their career endeavors by a wife primarily responsible for the family. Lacking personal experience in managing work-family conflicts, these leaders can be insensitive to the stereotypes and inequities currently faced by both genders.

* * *

Academe likes to believe it offers a work environment far more humane than the aggressive, competitive business world. Yet, in the work-family arena, colleges and university employers lag behind. Given academe's dependence on human capital to achieve its goals and its commitment to professional development and personal welfare for all its members, wouldn't more-enlightened work-family practices and programs make sense?

Fortunately, many opportunities exist for our institutions to make a material difference in the lives of their employees, without sacrificing institutional well-being, if they are willing to think adventurously — about the services they provide and the flexibility and options they make available to meet their employees' individual needs. The time is right for innovations and adaptations to benefit faculty seeking fulfillment in both their academic and personal lives. ■

References

American Association of University Professors. *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports.* Washington, DC: AAUP, 1990.

Bailyn, L. *Breaking the Mold: Women, Men, and Time in the New Corporate World.* New York: Macmillan, The Free Press, 1993.

Benedict, R., and C.A. Taylor. "Managing the Overlap of Work and Family: A Shared Responsibility." *CUPA Journal* 46, no. 3 (1995): 1-11.

Bohen, H., and A. Viveros-Long. *Balancing Jobs and Family Life: Do Flexible Schedules Help?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Brewer, B. "Dual-Career Couple Relocation: A Guide for Administrators at Purdue University." West Lafayette, IN: Women's Resource Office, Purdue University, 1996.

Childs, T. "When Work and Private Life Collide: Opening Communication Channels Between Manager and Employees." Presentation at the American Management Association's Annual Teleconference for Working Women, "Establishing Your Work/Life Agenda." West Lafayette, IN, October 24, 1996.

Duxbury, L., C. Higgins, and C. Lee. "Work-Family Conflict: A Comparison by Gender, Family Type, and Perceived Control." *Journal of Family Issues* 15, no 3 (1994): 449-466.

Eli Lilly and Company. "Managing Work and Your Personal Life." Indianapolis, IN: 1996.

Finkel, S.K., and S.G. Olswang. "Child Rearing as a Career Impediment to Women Assistant Professors." *The Review of Higher Education* 19, no. 2 (1996): 123-139.

Finkelstein, M.J., R.K. Seal, and J.H. Schuster. "The American Faculty in Transition: A First Look at the New Academic Generation." Paper prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics. NSOPF 93, December 1995.

Friedman, D.E., and E. Galinsky. "Work and Family Issues: A Legitimate Business Concern." In *Work, Families, and Organizations*, edited by S. Zedeck, pp. 168-207. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Friedman, D.E., C. Rimsky, and A.A. Johnson. *College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs: Report on a Collaborative Study*. New York: Families & Work Institute, 1996.

Froom, J.D., and J. Bickel. "Medical School Policies for Part-Time Faculty Committed to Full Professional Effort." *Academic Medicine* 71, no. 1 (1996): 92-96.

Galinsky, E., J.T. Bond, and D.E. Friedman. *Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families & Work Institute, 1993.

Galinsky, E., D.E. Friedman, and C.A. Hernandez. *The Corporate Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs*. New York: Families & Work Institute, 1991.

Gappa, J.M. "Off the Tenure Track: Six Models for Full-Time, Nontenurable Appointments." New Pathways Working Paper Series, no. 10. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1996.

Hammonds, K.H. "Balancing Work and Family." *BusinessWeek*, September 16, 1996, pp. 74-80.

Herndon, M.D. "Elder Care Comes of Age." *CUPA Journal* 46, no. 3 (1995): 35-38.

Hughes, D., and E. Galinsky. "Balancing Work and Family Lives: Research and Corporate Applications." In *Maternal Employment and Children's Development: Longitudinal Research*, edited by A.E. Gottfried and A.W. Gottfried, pp. 233-268. New York: Plenum, 1988.

——— . "Gender, Job and Family Conditions, and Psychological Symptoms." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1994): 251-270.

Ironson, G. "Work, Job Stress, and Heal[illegible]." In *Work, Families, and Organizations*, edited by S. Zedeck, pp. 33-69. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Johnsrud, L.K., and C.D. Des Jarlais. "Barriers to Tenure for Women and Minorities." *The Review of Higher Education* 17, no. 4 (1994): 335-353.

Jones, R.F., and S.C. Sanderson. "Tenure Policies in U.S. and Canadian Medical Schools." *Academic Medicine* 70, no. 12 (1994): 772-778.

Kuh, G.D., and E.J. Whitt. *The Invisible Tapestry: Cultures in American Colleges and Universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1988.

Lambert, S.J. "Workplace Policy as Social Policy." *Social Service Review* 67 (June 1993): 237-260.

MacDermid, S.M., and D.B. Targ. "A Call for Greater Attention to the Role of Employers in Developing, Transforming, and Implementing Family Policies." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 16, no. 1 (1995): 145-170.

Magner, D.K. "Fewer Professors Believe Western Culture Should Be the Cornerstone of the College Curriculum." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 13, 1996, pp. A12-A15.

Moskowitz, M. "100 Best Companies for Working Mothers." *Working Mother*, October 1996, pp. 10-65.

National Education Association, Higher Education Research Center. "Tenure." *Update* 1, no. 3 (September 1995): 1-6.

Parcel, T.L., and E.G. Menaghan. *Parents' Jobs and Children's Lives*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994.

Raabe, P.H. "Constructing Pluralistic Work and Career Arrangements That Are Family- and Work-Friendly." In *Rethinking Employment: The Work-Family Challenge*, edited by S. Lewis and J. Lewis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

——— . "Work-Family Policies for Faculty: How 'Career and Family-Friendly' Is Academe?" In *Academic Couples: Problems and Promises*, edited by M.A. Ferber and J.W. Loeb. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Rice, R.E. "Making a Place for the New American Scholar." New Pathways Working Paper Series, no. 1. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1996 .

Rogers, J. "Balancing Work and Family." Address at Kunz Center on Work & Family Conference, "Agenda for the 21st Century Labor Force: Implications of Family Structure, Diversity, and Jobs." Cincinnati, OH, November 1996.

Shellenbarger, S. "Family-Friendly Jobs Are the First Step to Efficient Workplaces." *Wall Street Journal*, May 15, 1996, p. B1.

Swiss, D.J., and J.P. Walker. *Women and the Work Family Dilemma*. New York: Wiley, 1993.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1995*, 115th ed. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1995.

University Task Force on Dependent Care. *Work and Family Strategies for the University of California*. Oakland, CA: Office of the President of the University of California, September 1991.

Voydanoff, P. *Work and Family Life*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987.

Wigton, R.S., and R.S. Waldman. "An Innovative Faculty Appointment System at the University of Nebraska." *Academic Medicine* 68, no. 3 (1993): 190-191.

Wilson, R. "Colleges Help Professors Balance Work and Family." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 17, 1995, p. A24.

——— . "Weary of Commuter Marriages, More Couples in Academe Make Career Sacrifices to Be Together." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 20, 1996, pp. A10-A11.

WORKING PAPER SERIES

[For papers not yet available at press time, page counts and release dates are approximate]

New Pathways Series Package

The complete set of 14 Working Papers detailed below. Ensures that you receive each paper as soon as it is released. Order the Package and save more than $50 over the price of purchasing each paper individually! (#FROOWP)

Making a Place for the New American Scholar

by **R. Eugene Rice**, scholar-in-residence and director, Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards, AAHE

Presents a richly textured vision of the role of the scholar in a rapidly changing, democratic America. Frames key questions to be addressed in rethinking and restructuring faculty careers. (#FRO1WP, 48PP, MARCH 1996)

Tenure Snapshot

by **Cathy A. Trower**, senior researcher, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education

Outlines current areas of concern, ongoing initiatives, and national trends related to academic tenure. Based on a November 1995 AAHE survey distributed to 1,200 four-year college and university provosts, with the intention of building an archive of information on current tenure policies, practices, and trends. (#FRO2WP, 32PP, MARCH 1996)

Where Tenure Does Not Reign: Colleges With Contract Systems

by **Richard Chait**, professor, and **Cathy A. Trower**, senior researcher, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education

Presents the experiences of campuses without tenure and campuses where faculty may choose tenure or contracts. Issues covered include academic freedom, faculty recruitment, selectivity, turnover, and reward structures. Answers the question, "What lessons can be learned from campuses with contract systems?" (#FRO3WP, 34PP, MARCH 1997)

New Yardsticks to Measure Financial Distress

by **Kent John Chabotar**, vice president, business and finance, Bowdoin College; and **James P. Honan**, lecturer, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education

Offers suggestions for new criteria and yardsticks to gauge a college's financial condition, and identifies means to equitably balance employment security for faculty with programmatic flexibility for institutions.

(#FRO4WP, 38PP, AUGUST 1996)

Academic Freedom Without Tenure?

by **J. Peter Byrne**, professor, Georgetown University Law Center

Conceptualizes one or more procedures where academic freedom could be uncoupled from academic tenure — where some other means are offered to ensure the professoriate the unfettered opportunity to teach and conduct research — and explores the tradeoffs involved in doing so. (#FRO5WP, 25PP, JANUARY 1997)

Two Faculties or One? The Conundrum of Part-Timers in a Bifurcated Workforce

by **Judith M. Gappa**, vice president for human relations, Purdue University; and **David W. Leslie**, professor of education, College of William and Mary

Describes the dual labor market in academe, based on the authors' book *The Invisible Faculty*, data from the 1993 NCES Survey, and other sources. Focuses on the effect of the dual labor market on tenured and tenure-track faculty, part-time and temporary faculty, and institutions. Explores possible changes that would transform the dual labor market into a more flexible and integrated employment system. (#FRO6WP, 36PP, MAY 1997)

PRICING INFORMATION

INDIVIDUAL PAPERS (EACH): $10.00 EACH + $4.00 UPS SHIPPING (NONMEMBER)
$8.50 EACH + $4.00 UPS SHIPPING (AAHE MEMBER)
(MORE TO SHIP TO AK, HI, PR, AND FOREIGN ADDRESSES; CALL FOR RATES)

TOTAL COST FOR ALL 14 WORKING PAPERS IF BOUGHT INDIVIDUALLY: $196.00 (NONMEMBER)
$175.00 (AAHE MEMBER)

COMPLETE SERIES PACKAGE (ALL 14 PAPERS): $140.00 (NONMEMBER) INCLUDES $21 POSTAGE
$120.00 (AAHE MEMBER) INCLUDES $21 POSTAGE

Heeding New Voices

by **R. Eugene Rice**, scholar-in-residence and director, Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards, AAHE; and **campus-based interviewers**

Reports on structured interviews conducted with new faculty and graduate students who will be the professoriate of the future. Considers what changes need to be made in the faculty career to make it more enticing, self-renewing, and resilient for the individual and to provide greater flexibility for institutions. (#FRO7WP, approx 48pp, coming in 1998)

Work, Family, and the Faculty Career

by **Judith M. Gappa**, vice president for human relations, Purdue University, and **Shelley M. MacDermid**, associate professor and director, Center for Families, Purdue University

Examines the conflicts faculty face as they try to balance personal and professional lives throughout their careers; considers actions universities and colleges can take to help. Includes an overview of institutional leadership initiatives, policies, strategies, programs, and practices aimed at reducing the stress these conflicts cause and enhancing the performance and satisfaction of faculty. (#FRO8WP, 40pp, August 1997)

Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Practices

by **Richard Chait**, professor, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education

Examines tenure by objectives (a reconfiguration of the probationary period), post-tenure reviews that focus more on departments than on individual faculty performance, and codification of academic freedom without tenure (including a draft policy by Martin Michaelson for discussion). (#FRO9WP, 44pp, August 1998)

Off the Tenure Track: Six Models for Full-Time, Nontenurable Appointments

by **Judith M. Gappa**, vice president for human relations, Purdue University

Explores nontraditional, full-time faculty appointments that are being used as alternatives to traditional tenure-track faculty careers, and the academic and other reasons underlying their increasing use. (#FR10WP, 44pp, December 1996)

Senior Faculty Considering Retirement: A Developmental & Policy Issue

by **Ann Ferren**, vice president for academic affairs and professor of education, Radford University

Examines what influences senior faculty in making decisions about the timing of retirement. Focuses on the interaction between individual development and planning and institutional policies and planning. (#FR11WP, 38pp, March 1998)

Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, Precautions

by **Christine M. Licata**, associate dean for academic affairs, Rochester Institute of Technology, and **Joseph C. Morreale**, vice provost for planning, assessment, and research and professor of public administration, Pace University

Reviews current institutional policies and practices aimed at periodically evaluating tenured faculty. Topics examined include: campus goals for post-tenure review; specific evaluation criteria/procedures; implementation considerations and resource implications. Discusses the opportunities and difficulties associated with the initiation of such reviews, and how institutions handle measurement of outcomes and effectiveness. (#FR12WP, 90pp, March 1997)

Employment Practices in the Professions: Fresh Ideas From Inside and Outside the Academy

by **C. Ann Trower**, senior researcher, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education

Explores employment arrangements in other professions such as law, medicine, and management and in think-tanks, to ascertain whether policies and practices in these settings have applicability and hold promise for higher education. (#FR13WP, 72pp, September 1998)

Alternatives to Tenure for the Next Generation of Academics

by **David W. Breneman**, professor and dean of education, University of Virginia

Helps answer the question, "What, if anything, would induce individual faculty to renounce tenure?" Develops approaches that could be used to understand the financial value that faculty assign to tenure and the relative appeal of various inducements to forego tenure. (#FR14WP, 24pp, April 1997)

Ordering Information — Use Accompanying Order Form!

1. Save more than $50 over the individual paper price by ordering the Complete Working Paper Series package (all 14 papers). Upon receipt of your Package order, papers already released will be shipped immediately; future papers will be shipped automatically as they are released.
2. Any individual Working Paper can be ordered at any time; papers ordered in advance of their release dates will be shipped automatically as soon as they are available.
3. To get the discounted member price, please provide your 7-digit member number off a *Bulletin/Change* mailing label. (Note: AAHE is an individual member association; your institution cannot be a member.)
4. AAHE does not accept returns or exchanges. Once ordered, Packages cannot be cancelled or refunded.

AAHE Publications Order Form

New Pathways Working Paper Series

□Dr. □Mr. □Ms. _____ □M □F

Title _____ Institution _____

Address □Work □Home _____

City _____ St _____ Zip _____ Daytime ph (_____)_____

I □am not / □am an AAHE member _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ (7-digit number off *Change/Bulletin* label)

Item #	Item	Unit Price AAHE Member	Unit Price Nonmember	Qty	Subtotal
FR00WP	**Complete Working Paper Series Package** Includes all 14 papers listed below	$120.00 *(includes shipping for complete Package)*	$140.00		
FR01WP	**Making a Place for the New American Scholar**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR02WP	**Tenure Snapshot**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR03WP	**Where Tenure Does Not Reign: Contract Systems**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR04WP	**New Yardsticks to Measure Financial Distress**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR05WP	**Academic Freedom Without Tenure?**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR06WP	**Two Faculties or One? Part-Timers**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR07WP	**Heeding New Voices**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR08WP	**Work, Family, and the Faculty Career**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR09WP	**Ideas in Incubation**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR10WP	**Off the Tenure Track: Six Models**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR11WP	**Senior Faculty Considering Retirement**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR12WP	**Post-Tenure Review**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR13WP	**Employment Practices in the Professions**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		
FR14WP	**Alternatives to Tenure**	$8.50 ea	$10.00 ea		

Shipping: Choose a method and add the shipping charge on Line E only if you are ordering individual papers. Price of Series Package includes shipping.

Destination	Method	Indiv Paper Subtotal (Line B) $0-$25	$25.01-$100*
U.S.**	UPS Ground	$4	$6
	UPS 2nd Day	$10	$12
	FedEx Overnite	$22	$35
Canada	CanTrak***	$6	$6
Foreign	Air Mail***	$20	$20

*Large orders will be billed the actual shipping cost.
** AK, HI, PR must choose UPS 2nd Day.
***Call or fax for quotes on faster methods.

Package $_____ A

Individual Paper(s) Subtotal $_____ B

(A + B) TOTAL $_____ C

DC Addresses ONLY, Add Tax 5.75% of Line C $_____ D

(Use table at left) Shipping $_____ E

AMOUNT DUE $_____

Payment Method (F.I.D. #52-0891675)

□Check to AAHE enclosed □Purchase order enclosed #_____

□VISA □MasterCard □Bill me (AAHE members only)

_____
Credit card number Exp. date

_____
Cardholder name Cardholder signature

Mail/Fax to: AAHE Publication Orders, Box WP08, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110, fax 202/293-0073. **To Place Your Order by Phone, or For More Information:** Call 202/293-6440 x11.

ver 8/6/98